

Public Safety Radio Strategic Planning Executive Committee
Wednesday, March 28, 2007

1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

Governor's Office of Emergency Services / 3650 Schriever Ave. Mather, CA 96566

Meeting Summary

1. Welcome & Call to Order

Adam Sutkus, facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento, called the meeting to order. He welcomed representatives to the first PSRSPC quarterly meeting of 2007 and began the meeting with a round of introductions.

2. Chair's Comments

On behalf of the PSRSPC chair Henry Renteria, Deputy Director Frank McCarton welcomed participants to the meeting. Specifically, Director Renteria wanted to extend a special welcome to the new PSRSPC members Department of Health Services, Department of Finance and the Military Department. Mr. McCarton noted that although this was the first meeting of group (in 2007) a lot of work has been going on. Six mobile communications units are being worked on and OES is moving toward obtaining professional services for the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) and the Tactical Interoperability Communication Plans (TICPs) that will feed into the SCIP. Mr. McCarton noted that last week the Department of General Services (DGS), the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) and local folks had a meeting in Los Angeles to plan for the SCIP. These efforts will also help the PSRSPC move forward in implementing the 2007 annual report.

3. Legislative Update

Mr. McCarton reported that after a lot of work, especially by OES staff, the PSRSPC annual report is no longer 'draft' – it has been finalized. The final report will be emailed to all PSRSPC members as soon as possible. Mr. McCarton said that he knows some PSRSPC members have already had hearings with the legislators and have been asked about [the Annual Report]. Getting it finalized was complicated and took a lot of negotiation. There had been some embarrassment over the delay and everyone's support has been appreciated. In closing he said everyone should be proud of the report.

4. DHS Grants

Robert Samaan, OHS, talked about federal Department of Homeland Security grant opportunities. Mr. Samaan said that he too attended the SCIP planning meeting in Los Angeles last week. Representatives from the Department of Commerce were also in attendance. They have the rights to administer one billion in funding for interoperable communications. The deadline to apply for these funds will approach very quickly. The good thing is that the program will be administered through the state. There is nothing in writing yet so the details are not clear. But July 15, 2007 the money is to be allocated to the state. The Department of Commerce plans to use a risk model which puts California in a good position. No other factors have been released but it is likely there will be an 80/20 split. Eighty percent will go to local government and twenty

percent for statewide efforts. Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) could be organized with locals for statewide efforts, but local regions have many needs. Five percent will go for planning purposes in the coming months. The draft SCIP is due in September and the Department of Commerce will review the SCIP in its draft form. There will then be a peer review process. Please contact Mr. Samaan or Vinnie Buehler to learn more.

OHS recently held it's first State Homeland Security grant guidance workshop in Sacramento. DHS is expecting state agencies to submit 2007 grant applications.

Mr. Samaan also noted that OHS is requiring that all local jurisdictions participate in a TICP by the end of 2008 to qualify for Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) dollars. Local areas should work with their CALSIEC region on the TICPs. He also mentioned that subgrantee jurisdictions need to complete the communications survey.

5. Changes to Public Safety Government Code Section 8592

Bill DeCamp is giving an update on what has happened with code changes. He referred the handout in the meeting packet that noted the 2007 content changes were underlined. Highlights:

- PSRSPC is required to hold a joint meeting with the CALSIEC organization.
- Everyone needs to comply with P25 standards (8592.5 b)
 - There was a question as to how often DGS is asked to provide a waiver (in regards to complying with P25 standards). The response was that DGS can do a waiver, but it is rare. A waiver had been given to CDF in the past year.

Mr. DeCamp finished by reiterating that 8592.6 is really encouraging collaboration.

6. Summary of 2007 Legislative Report Goals & Tasks:

Holly Ziegler, OES, asked participants to pull two documents out of their packet, a spreadsheet and the listing of PSRSPC Technical Working Group activities. There is a lot of work to do. Since there is so much work the TWG has prioritized the goals and activities. TWG members are very busy so they really can only do this work during work group meetings and therefore TWG meetings have been restructured. Work toward the various goals (leadership; funding; governance; convergence; technology) has been distributed across the work groups. This is demonstrated in the activities listing.

7. Fiscal Overview & Planning: GEOC Coordination 08/09 Budget Change Proposals

Peggy Okabayashi and Sue Plantz talked about the desire to coordinate Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) among PSRSPC member agencies. This is a sensitive effort because BCPs are confidential in nature. Coordinated BCPs will go to the Governor's Emergency Operations Executive Council (GEOEC).

Ms. Okabayashi summarized the BCP coordination process that the GEOEC went through in January 2007. She explained that the state agencies were asked to prepare a consolidated BCP package for the Department of Finance and Governor's Office. Twenty-one BCPs were brought

forward by state agencies. Only four were accepted as matching all the DOF criteria. Each department developed their own BCP and then they were looked at through the priorities set for the state. So now the same process is being looked at for the PSRSPC.

Agencies should provide a high level executive summary so that confidentiality is respected but work can go forward. Participants were asked if they would like to do the initial BCP review themselves and then cc TWG members, or, have the TWG members do the initial review of the BCPs?

Mr. Sutkus asked if there were any questions regarding the relationship between the PSRSPC and GEOEC.

- It was then clarified that the GEOEC does not have veto ability over the PSRSPC. The GEOEC is looking to the PSRSPC to come up with what is needed. Mr. McCarton explained that it will be helpful to all to be able to say that the given BCPs have been vetted by both the PSRSPC and the GEOEC. When member agencies are in front of the legislature everyone will be able to say the same thing. Of course the struggle is with resource limitations and so the Governor's office needs to see how the BCPs fit in with priorities.
- Next the group discussion turned to each agency's relationship with their Department of Finance representative and the new process being discussed. DOF explained that their analysts will continue to work with agencies on conceptual BCPs. This process will not change. Remember that DOF does not say 'no' to a BCP, they give feedback. DOF is not the decision maker, the administration makes the decision. Agencies should be creative in thinking about things in spite of difficult general fund issues.
- Mr. McCarton clarified that the PSRSPC isn't going to say 'no' to an agency's BCP. The idea is to see how various efforts fit into the statewide plan and/or to say that some things aren't compatible. This is a historic new way of working together.
- It was also clarified that at the PSRSPC group participation level the DOF is going to be thinking about global funding strategies and will not be taking detailed concepts back to analysts. Ms. Okabayashi noted that even with the GEOEC process the DOF was in an advisory position. Each agency presented their BCP concept. The concepts were connected to the various (state) strategies and then they were matched up with the criteria the DOF had laid out. The GEOEC's role is not to say that your BCP concept is not going forward, but to say what objective and investment justification does your BCP concept match up to. She explained that criteria from the DOF will be coming to help member agencies craft current BCP concepts.
- Mr. Sutkus reminded everyone that the GEOEC is a coalition of agencies and even though only a few of the BCPs met all the criteria they still felt it was important to present all the information to each other as an educational process (even though they knew they'd be thrown out for not matching with the DOF criteria).
- There was a request to clarify what "approval" of the BCPs means. Maybe this is the wrong word; maybe the process should be labeled criteria matching.

Mr. Sutkus brought the topic back to who would do the initial review of the concept BCPs and staff asked for representatives to vote on the process desired. The members voted to have the Technical Working Group do an initial review and then give the PSRSPC Executive a recommendation.

8. CALSIEC Collaboration

Bill DeCamp explained that there has been a lot of effort happening in reaching out to locals. PSRSPC members are helping locals to produce TICPs. In January a preliminary draft template was put together to assist locals with their TICPs. The Sacramento and San Diego areas have generously allowed the PSRSPC to use their TICPs as models. San Diego's was rated at the highest level by the Feds. The draft guidance also incorporates some of the SCIP requirements and criteria. Hopefully that will make work on the SCIP easier. Mr. DeCamp also noted that SAFECOM just two weeks ago came out with a template for the SCIP.

Holly Ziegler reminded members of upcoming meetings and asked for agency support and participation. April 8, 2007 a CALSIEC committee meeting will be held in Cordelia. And the official joint PSRSPC/CALSIEC meeting will be held on May 8. The first part of this meeting will have a high-level focus for Executives and then there will be a break and then the meeting will become more technical.

9. Technical Working Group Member Comments

There were no comments.

10. Consultative Organization Comments

There were no comments.

11. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

12. Future Meeting Dates

Members confirmed that they will still hold a meeting in June (even though there will be the joint May 8 meeting). There was discussion of setting a standing meeting date so that PSRSPC meetings can always be on people's calendars. The meetings will be held on the last Wednesday of each quarter.

13. Closing Remarks, Adjourn

Mr. McCarton thanked everyone for their hard work and wished Richard Osborne good luck in his retirement. The meeting adjourned at 2:55pm.